



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/564,917	01/17/2006	Mark T. Johnson	GB 030117	5325
24737 7590 04/15/2009 PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS P.O. BOX 3001 BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510				
EXAMINER				
STPA, GRANT				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2629				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/15/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/564,917

Applicant(s)

JOHNSON ET AL.

Examiner

GRANT D. SITTA

Art Unit

2629

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 January 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 17 January 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/13/2007
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, and 10-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Friend et al (6,429,601) hereinafter, Friend.

3. In regards to claims 1 and 14, Friend teaches an active matrix **(col. 4, lines 14-15 and abstract)** display device (6) comprising a display (2) with a plurality of display pixels (3), each having **(fig. 6 (23, 23, 21))**:

a current driven emissive element (14)**(fig. 5 19a-19d)**;

a data input (10) for receiving an analogue data signal **(fig. 5 input to (34))**;

at least one drive element (T2) connected to a power supply and arranged to drive said current emissive element (14) in accordance with said data signal **(fig. 5 15a-d, 13a connected to data line, and connected to the scan line (10))**;

selecting means (T1; T1,T3,T4) arranged to provide **(fig. 5 (13a-d))**, in response to a select signal (18) **(fig. 5 10 scan line)**, said data signal to said at least one drive element (T2) to generate an overall brightness level during a frame period (F) in

accordance with said data signal **(fig. 7 and 8 and col. 7, lines 18-35)**, wherein said device (6) is adapted to divide said frame period (F) in at least a first sub-period (F1) during which said emissive element **(fig. 8 pulses contained in a frame)((14)** carries a first non-zero current (I1) **(fig. 8 up arrow next to current and corresponding pulses, set of two pulses)** and a second sub-period (F2) during which said emissive element (14) carries a second non-zero current (I2) **(fig. 8 second of two pulses)**, said at least first and second non-zero current substantially yielding said overall brightness level **(col. 7, lines 18-35)**.

4. In regards to claim 2, Friend teaches an active matrix display device (col. 4, lines 14-15) (6) according to claim 1, wherein said device (6) comprises a display controller (7) (fig. 6 (24) control apparatus) for generating said select signal (18) (fig. 6 (25) and fig. 5 scan lines (10)), said select signal (18) comprising at least a first select signal (18') triggering said first sub-period (F1) and a second select signal (18'') triggering said second sub-period (F2) (fig. 7 and 8 and col. 7, lines 18-35).

5. In regards to claim 6, Friend teaches an active matrix display device (6) according to claim 1, wherein said device (6) comprises a display controller (7) adapted to generate at least said first current (I1) and said second current (I2) by varying a voltage (13;15) over said current driven emissive element (14) (fig. 6 (24), fig. 7 varied current and col. 7, lines 18-35).

6. In regards to claim 7, Friend teaches an active matrix display device (6) according to claim 1, wherein said drive element (T2) is a thin film transistor having a short channel length (col. 4, lines 3-25).

7. In regards to claim 8, Friend teaches active matrix display device (6) according to claim 1, wherein said display pixels (3) are arranged in a matrix of rows (4) and columns (5), said device (6) comprising lines (13;15) for manipulating a voltage for said drive element (T2) for each row (4) or group of rows (4), and said device (6) comprises a display controller (7) adapted to scan said lines (13;15) along said rows (4) or group of rows (4) across the display (2) (fig. 6 25, 26 and fig. 8 pulses col. 7, lines 28-67).

8. In regards to claim 10, Friend teaches an active matrix display device (6) according to claim 1, wherein said display (2) comprises a subset of display pixels (3) or emissive elements (14) and said device (6) is adapted to supply said first non-zero current (I1) and said second non-zero current (I2) to only said subset (col. 7, lines 36-67).

9. In regards to claim 11, Friend teaches an active matrix display device (6) according to claim 10, wherein said display pixels (3) are coloured display pixels

comprising red, green and blue emissive elements (14) and said subset is defined by colour (col. 6, lines 1-10) .

10. In regards to claim 12, Friend teaches an active matrix display device (6) according to claim 11, wherein said subset consists of said red and blue emissive elements (14) (col. 6, lines 5-10).

11. In regards to claim 13, Friend teaches an active matrix display device (6) according to claim 11, wherein said subset consists of said green emissive elements (col. 6, lines 5-10).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
14. Claims 3, 4, and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Friend in view of Yamazaki et al (6,326,941) hereinafter, Yamazaki.
15. In regards to claim 3, Friend differs from the claimed invention in that Friend does not disclose wherein said first sub-period (F1) and said second sub-period (F2) are of different duration

However, Yamazaki teaches a system and method for wherein said first sub-period (F1) and said second sub-period (F2) are of different duration (fig. 5b col. 7, lines 1-56 varied duration and current of Yamazaki).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to modify Friend to include the use of various pulse shapes during sub-periods or different durations of sub-periods as taught by Yamazaki in order to improve display quality with higher gradation between frame as stated in (col. 3, lines 35-67).
16. In regards to claim 4, Friend as modified by Yamazaki teaches an active matrix display device (6) according to claim 3, wherein said first sub-period (F1) has a shorter duration than said second sub-period (F2) (fig. 5b 64To and 16To Yamazaki).
17. Claim 5 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 3. Furthermore, Friend as modified by Yamazaki teaches an active matrix display device (6) according to claim 1,

wherein said first non-zero current exceeds said second non-zero current (fig. 5b 64 To, 16 To Yamazaki).

18. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Friend.

19. Friend does not disclose expressly wherein said device (6) is adapted to yield a brightness at said second non-zero current (I2) of 30% or less of the brightness at said first non-zero current (I1).

However, Applicant has not disclosed that having a device adapted to yield a brightness at said second non-zero current (I2) of 30% or less of the brightness at said first non-zero current (I1) provides an advantage, is used for a particular purpose, or solves a stated problem. As such, having 30%, 40% or 50% is an obvious matter of design choice.

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have the device of Friend adapted to yield a brightness at said second non-zero current (I2) of any percentage, including 30% or less, of the brightness at said first non-zero current (I1) because any percentage would perform equally well at providing the predictable result of providing a cumulative luminance that improves picture quality.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to GRANT D. SITTA whose telephone number is (571)270-1542. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sumati Lefkowitz can be reached on 571-272-3638. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Sumati Lefkowitz/
Supervisor Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2629

/Grant D Sitta/
Examiner, Art Unit 2629
April 11, 2009